GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000

beyond the application in which it is contained. The same holds true with paragraph [0051] which, again, refers only to the system and method of Bradbury et al.

Additionally, there is no factual evidence whatsoever from the record in support of the Examiner's rationale for rejection. The Examiner states that the proposed combination "would increase the responsiveness of the implant preparation and surgical planning process." How does the Examiner know this? Similarly, how does the Examiner know that the combination "would allow customized construction of implants, and would yield superior dimensional matching to a patient's body"? The system of Bradbury already allows for the customized construction of implants, and according to Bradbury, by itself, yields superior dimensional matching. Thus, there appears to be no reason or justification for the proposed combination. Finally, the Examiner argues that the proposed combination would "promote superior tissue and bone ingrowth." Again, these remarks by Bradbury have only to do with Bradbury, and do not provide factual evidence for the proposed combination.

With regard to optical monitoring, the Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to modify Jang "since optical detection means can be utilized to monitor physical dimensions of deposits, and a feedback controller can utilize this to adjust a laser to thereby control the rate of material deposition." However, while this may be the reason why *Applicant* prefers such a technique, there is no teaching or suggestion *from the prior art* in support of the proposed combination with respect to Applicant's claims, which are formulated in combination. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

The Examiner's other conclusions are as well unfounded. That it would be obvious to modify Jang "since this would allow a part to be inspected at a later point after fabrication," refers only to Bradbury at paragraph [0031]. "To fabricate scaffold structures in the method taught ... would allow superior dimensional matching to a patient's body which would promote healing," is specific to the teachings of Bradbury, and do not carry over to the proposed combination.

Based on the foregoing comments, Applicant continues to believe the present application is in condition for allowance. Questions regarding this application may be directed to the undersigned attorney by telephone, facsimile or electronic mail.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

John G. Posa
Reg. No. 37,424
Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,
Anderson & Citkowski, PC
PO Box 7021
Troy, MI 48007-7021
(734) 913-9300 FAX (734) 913-6007
Email: jposa@patlaw.com

Dated: June 13, 2006

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000